UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,556	04/05/2001	Anthony P. Mauro	010034	6493

23696 7590 09/28/2006

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
FIELDS, COURTNEY D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/828,556	Applicant(s) MAURO ET AL.	
	Examiner Courtney D. Fields	Art Unit 2137	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: _____.
   Claim(s) objected to: _____.
   Claim(s) rejected: _____.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The Examiner will maintain the finality of the rejection in which the prior art Boneh et al. (Pub No. 2002/0112167) in view of Jones et al. (US Patent No.6,088,800) discloses the following claim limitations: With regards to claim 1, (Boneh et al. in view of Jones et al.) discloses means for implementing cryptographic acceleration function of a software application utilizing the security protocol IPSec (See Jones et al., Column 5, lines 44-53). Data can be transferred among processors operating one layer of the multi-layer protocol such as IPSec and SSL by utilizing operands of the encryption pipeline processor (See Column 6, lines 18-28). Boneh et al. also discloses a high performance processor, such as a digital signal processor, operating on one layer of an SSL protocol (See page 5, Section 0061) Furthermore, both Boneh et al. and Jones et al. disclose the means for accessible memory to each of the processors passing operands (See Boneh et al., page 5, Section 0062 and Jones et al., Column 7, lines 15-34). With regards to claim 7, (Boneh et al. in view of Jones et al.) discloses means for implementing cryptographic acceleration function of a software application utilizing the security protocol IPSec (See Jones et al., Column 5, lines 44-53). Boneh et al. discloses means for an authentication algorithm wherein the message authentication code (MAC) protects the user passwords against dictionary attacks within transparent encryption. (See Page 4, Section 0054) Jones et al. discloses means for shared memory wherein each processor has access to the data memory space within a processing element. The shared memory is accessible to all processing elements within an encryption algorithm which allows each processor to have one or more encryption algorithms (See Column 7, lines 25-38) Furthermore, both Boneh et al. and Jones et al. disclose the means for a processor coupled to the memory (See Boneh et al., page 2, Section 0024 and Jones et al., page 4, lines 12-18) and a high performance processor coupled to the memory (See Boneh et al., page 5, Section 0061 and Jones et al., Column 6, lines 3-17). With regards to claim 12,(Boneh et al. in view of Jones et al.) discloses means for partitioning a multi-layer security services by utilizing the web browser and opening an SSL session as shown in Boneh et al., page 2, Sections 0022, 0057-0058) Jones et al. discloses means for shared memory wherein each processor has access to the data memory space within a processing element. The shared memory is accessible to all processing elements within an encryption algorithm which allows each processor to have one or more encryption algorithms (See Column 7, lines 25-38) Jones et al. discloses the means for a multi-layer security services protocol partitioned between each of the first and second processor cores as shown in Column 7, lines 39-64. Furthermore, Jones et al. discloses the means for one or more application program interfaces operated by the first processor core for interfacing between the security services protocol and the second processor core as shown in Column 17, lines 7-12 and a modular math function operating on the second processor core as shown in Column 8, lines 12-67) With regards to claim 15, (Boneh et al. in view of Jones et al.) discloses means for implementing cryptographic acceleration function of a software application utilizing the security protocol IPSec (See Jones et al. Column 5, lines 44-53). Jones et al. discloses the means for a multi-layer security services protocol partitioned between each of the first and second processor cores as shown in Column 7, lines 39-64. Jones et al. discloses the means for distributing the function to a second high performance processor via a memory shared by both first and second processors and performing the distributing the function in the high performance processor as shown in Column 6, lines 44-67 and Column 7, lines 1-14) Furthermore, Jones et al. discloses the means for returning a result of the distributed function from the high performance processor via the shared memory as shown in Column 7, lines 25-38. .